UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,615	06/23/2003	George B. Byma	1-73826	8851

27377 7590 03/24/2005

MACMILLAN, SOBANSKI & TODD, LLC
ONE MARITIME PLAZA-FOURTH FLOOR
720 WATER STREET
TOLEDO, OH 43604

EXAMINER	
RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1771	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,615	BYMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ula C Ruddock	1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/25/03.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

   I. Claims 1-9, drawn to a laminate, classified in class 442, subclass 179.

   II. Claims 10-20, drawn to a method of making said laminate, classified in class 156, subclass 60.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product can be made by another method, i.e. by extruding the core, adhesive layer, and structural reinforcement layers.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Theddford Hitaffer on November 29, 2004, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-9. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 10-

20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 10/440708. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are obvious variants over one another.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/440800. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are obvious variants over one another.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

9. Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of copending Application No. 10/440889. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are obvious variants over one another.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Michael (US 2003/0121989). Michael discloses a headliner [0002] comprising fibers selected from a group

consisting of natural fibers, synthetic fibers, and mixtures thereof. Natural fibers include sisal, hemp, and kenaf fibers and synthetic fibers include carbon fibers [0007]. The resinous binder that binds the fibers together includes a thermoset resin including a urethane resin binder [0010].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael (US 2003/0121989), as shown above, in view of Michael (US 2003/0124271). Michael '989 discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching that the carbon fibers are produced from petroleum pitch and that the carbon fibers comprises at least 50% of the total weight of the mat. Michael (US 2003/0124271) discloses a headliner [0028 and 0052] comprising a mat made of carbon fibers [0007]. The carbon fibers can be pitch carbon and be present in an amount from about 10-50% by weight based on the total weight of the mat [0038]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used Michael's 50% pitch carbon as the carbon fibers in Michael '989, motivated by the desire to create a headliner that is lightweight and less costly to manufacture.

14. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael (US 2003/0121989) in view of Fletemier et al. (US 6,156,682). Michael discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of the additional layers in the headliner as taught in the present invention.

Fletemier et al. (US 6,156,682) disclose a vehicle headliner comprising a fibrous core, a thermosetting resin, chopped fibers applied to opposite sides of the core layer, a decorative layer, and an impervious film and finish scrim applied to the opposite side of the core (col 2, ln 3-10). The fibrous reinforcement layers comprise basalt fibers (col 4, ln 16-18). As seen in Figure 1, reference point 22 is a decorative covering, reference point 19 is a polymer film, reference points 14 and 16 are fibrous reinforcement layers, reference point 12 is the core, reference point 18 is a polymer film, and reference point 20 is a scrim. The adhesive resin is an elastomeric thermosetting resin, preferably a curable urethane (col 5, ln 19-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used Michael's carbon mat as one of Fletemier's fibrous reinforcement layers, motivated by the desire to create a headliner that is lightweight and less costly to manufacture.

15. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael (US 003/0121989) and Fletemier et al. (US 6,156,682) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of McConnell et al. (US 4,812,186). Michael and Fletemier et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the teaching that there is a layer of adhesive interposed between the core and the first and second structural reinforcement layers. McConnell et al. (US 4,812,186) disclose a headliner (col 1, ln 11-13) comprising a first polyurethane adhesive (col 2, ln 19-30) and a second adhesive made of a similar adhesive composition as that applied in the first adhesive (col 3, ln 1-11). The adhesive penetrates the reinforcing layers and serves to the reinforcing layer, when cure, to the core material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used

McConnell's adhesive layers in the headliner of Michael and Fletemeir et al., motivated by the desire to create a headliner that has increased structural integrity and dimensional stability.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ula C Ruddock whose telephone number is 571-272-1481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H. Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UCR

Ula Ruddock

Ula C. Ruddock
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 1700